



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Die Akkadische Sprache: Vortrag gehalten auf dem fünften internationalen Orientalisten-Congresse in Berlin, von PAUL HAUPT, mit dem Keilschrifttexte des fünfspaltigen Vocabulars K. 4225, so wie zweier Fragmente der babylonischen Sintflutherzählung, und einem Anhang von O. DONNER über die Verwandtschaft des Sumerisch-Akkadischen mit den ural-altaischen Sprachen. Berlin: Asher u. Co. 1883.

Dr. Haupt's earlier works on the pre-Semitic language of Chaldaea were written chiefly for cuneiformists. His paper, read before the Oriental Congress of 1881, presented the results of Akkadian research in a succinct and popular form, and was intended for linguists generally. It is now reprinted separately, with important additions that are indicated in the title, and with many further notes and references. A review of this essay will be more intelligible after a brief survey of the other works of the author upon which this is largely based.

Akkadian studies were first set upon a sure footing by the publication in 1879 of Dr. Haupt's "Sumerische Familiengesetze," a work which contained at the same time the best contribution yet made to the comparative phonology of the Semitic languages on the basis of an analysis of the Assyrian forms occurring in the bilingual texts cited in the book.¹ Here for the first time a true scientific method was employed, every reading of an Akkadian sign or sign-group, and every proposed rendering being rigorously verified from the vocabularies of the Assyrian scholars themselves, or from the coherent texts. Thus the field was marked out plainly once for all, and it is a proof of the sureness of Dr. Haupt's methods and the accuracy of his deductions that, after more than three years of continued work and progress, very little that was stated for the first time in the "Familiengesetze" stands in need of correction.

The next most important advance in this young science was the fixing of the two main dialects of the Proto-Chaldaean language. Sayce and Lenormant had already divined that the first two columns in the so-called "Trilingual Tablet" in II Rawl. 31 represented not two different languages, but divergent forms of the same language. The detailed evidence of relationship, however, and the proof that the new dialect was much more than a mere local variation, were given by Dr. Haupt in his paper published in the *Götting. Nachrichten* in Nov. 1880: "Ueber einen Dialekt der sumerischen Sprache." In this paper the leading phonetic changes were formulated and verified, and at the same time a list was given of the coherent texts published in the fourth volume of the "Cuneiform Inscriptions," which were composed in the two dialects respectively.

The author's next work, "Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte" (autographed in 4to), is the most elaborate and important he has yet published.

¹ The Assyrian portion of this work has already been noticed in this Journal by Prof. Francis Brown in his article, "Recent work in Assyriology," Vol. II, p. 227.

The first three parts appeared in 1881. Part I is introductory, containing a "Schrifttafel" of Assyrian syllabic values, a "Zeichensammlung" of 887 ideograms with their Akkadian and Assyrian cuneiform interpretation, an Akkado-Assyrian, and a Sumero-Akkado-Assyrian cuneiform vocabulary. Parts II and III contain a selection of Akkadian and Sumerian texts respectively, edited with scrupulous accuracy, and many of them published for the first time. Part IV appeared in the spring of 1882; it contains an outline of Akkadian grammar, an Akkadian glossary, with notes upon the "Schrifttafel" and upon a part of the "Zeichensammlung." The fifth and last part will complete the proof passages for the "Zeichensammlung" and the vocabularies, and explain some of the more difficult passages in the texts. It is announced to appear shortly. This great work, which stands upon the highest level yet reached by Assyriological scholarship, is an invaluable repository of facts and data, and will probably always remain the sure foundation of Akkadian philology.

After these successive discoveries and publications, Dr. Haupt feels himself justified in calling the attention of philologists generally to the peculiarities of this important language. It will only be possible here to refer to those points which seem to be of the greatest importance for linguistic science.

The pre-Semitic language of Babylonia seems to have had two main literary dialects. Only two, at least, have been recognized in the documents that have come down to us. The names given to these are taken from the twofold division of the country indicated in the ordinary Assyrian appellation "Shumer (the Biblical Shinar) and Akkad." Before the dialects were definitely fixed, the term Akkadian was generally applied to the language in England and France, and the term Sumerian in Germany. Since that scientific event most scholars have followed Dr. Haupt in regarding the main dialect, or that in which most of the vocabularies and coherent texts are written, as the language of "Akkad" or Upper Babylonia, and the special idiom indicated by the technical term *eme sal*, or "Woman's Language," in the so-called "Trilingual Lists," as that of Shumer or Lower Babylonia.¹ Provisionally, it will perhaps be best to designate the whole language as Akkadian, after the main dialect; but it is unfortunate that no name has been generally adopted that would be perfectly unambiguous.

Some of the phonetic changes that mark the dialects are peculiarly interesting. For example, a Sumerian *m* appears as *g* in many corresponding Akkadian words. This is to be explained from the fact that *m* in Akkadian generally tended to the sound of *v* and was later so pronounced, and then we have the same change as that which is so striking in Persian and in the Romanic form

¹ It should be observed that the opposite view is stoutly maintained by the Munich Assyriologist, Fritz Hommel, who holds that the main dialect was spoken in Lower Babylonia and should therefore be called Sumerian, while the other dialect was the idiom of Upper Babylonia, and is therefore the true Akkadian. This theory he has advocated in various journals, and has finally maintained systematically in his work just issued, "Die vorsemitischen Culturen in Aegypten und Babylonien," Leipzig, 1883, p. 290 ff. His ingenious arguments can hardly be regarded as decisive, since the geographical references in the respective texts yet published are too meagre to base a sure inference upon. The final settlement of the question, however, as viewed from all sides, cannot long be delayed.

As to the general character of the literature of the two dialects respectively, it may be noted that the Akkadian documents, or those of the main dialect, abound in incantations and magical formulae, while the Sumerian consist chiefly of penitential psalms and prayers, unequalled for depth of religious feeling by anything in recorded ancient experience outside of the Bible.

of certain Teutonic words (*e. g. wise : guise*). Sumerian *b* between vowels also becomes *g* in Akkadian, showing that there it too had the sound of *v*. The vowel *e* also appears regularly in some Sumerian words in which we find *u* in Akkadian. Other changes are more sporadic, such as that of Sum. *d* to Akk. *g*, of *l* to *n*, and the startling but sufficiently attested correspondence between Sum. *š* and Akk. *n*. It should further be noticed that the changes of some sounds are not quite constant. Sumerian *š* becomes *z* in at least one clear case (Sum. *ši* "life" = Akk. *zi*); and Sumerian *e* sometimes appears in Akkadian as *a* instead of *u*. For example, the three forms *ma*, *me*, *mu* all mean "to speak." Dr. Haupt regards *ma* or *mā* in this case as the original form, from which, on the one side, *mu* arose through **mo*, and, on the other, *me* was differentiated. But it is perhaps somewhat hazardous to attempt the solution of Akkadian vocalic problems until something is known of the accentuation, which must have played a great part in the determination of vowel sounds in this simple and primitive type of language, since the same influence is now being proved to have controlled the vocalism even of Indo-European. Consonantal changes are perhaps more amenable to treatment; but even here there is evidently much that is puzzling. It may be expected, however, that the discovery of many more new texts in both dialects will enlarge our means of studying some of the most interesting problems of comparative phonology. The differences between the two dialects are not radical, they are phonetic and syntactical rather than formal, and their divergence is apt to be exaggerated from the difference in the modes of writing them. The Assyrian scholars in copying from Sumerian originals, which as well as the Akk. texts were written ideographically, were obliged to indicate to their contemporaries the Sum. pronunciation of those words that varied from the Akk. standard by writing them phonetically,¹ and thus the general appearance of a Sum. text differs strikingly from that of the more common Akk. documents.

The Sumero-Akkadian is tolerably rich in sounds. The vowels are *a*, *i*, *e*, *u*, which had probably both long and short values. It is also rich in sibilants, had simple *l* and *r* and the Arabic *gh*. The hard sounds *k*, *t*, *p*, *s* were not permitted at the end of words, and *r* was very rare at the beginning.

The structural type is agglutination of the simplest kind. The "roots," or rather the undetermined words, were perhaps originally monosyllabic. Nearly all, at least, are of but one syllable now, and the few dissyllables and trisyllables are clearly secondaries. In the monosyllabic simple words concurrent consonants are not admitted, and thus the language is singularly melodious. Vowel-harmony also prevails in certain combinations, but is not thoroughgoing.

As in all other languages there was originally no distinction in *form* between the noun and the verb. This is proved by the fact that they exist in precisely the same forms with precisely the same adjuncts, only that in later times a distinction was made by putting personal signs before the verb, while pronominal suffixes of nouns remained at the end. In the Sumerian dialect, however, which bears in general the stamp of greater antiquity, there is a postpositive conjuga-

¹ A common example will make this clearer. Akk. *dinger*, "God" = Sum. *dimmer*. In transcribing an ordinary Akk. text an ideogram for "God" would be read *dinger*. If the ideogram were used in a copy of a Sum. text it might be read in the same way, and so the scribes wrote out the Sum. word in syllable signs: *dim-me-ir*, to preclude mistakes.

tion, so that, for example, the same combination¹ might mean "his speech," "this speech," "he spoke." The differences in meaning were of course indicated by the accentuation, which is unknown to us.

For derivative nouns there are special prefixes, forming nouns of action, generalized terms, abstracts and nomina loci. There are also adjuncts to express different uses (*quasi* voices) of the verb, most of which are also prefixed. A "root," whether used as noun, verb, or adjective, may also be reduplicated to mark repetition or intensity, yielding plurals, collectives, frequentatives, or superlatives. The noun has no distinction of gender, number, or case, though *sal*, the ideogram for "female," is sometimes added to mark the feminine. The plural suffix *ene* occurs only with names of gods and demons. The genitive relation is indicated by suffixed particles which were originally locative nouns, and the dative by suffixed *ra*, originally a verb-noun "go."

In the verb there are two tenses, a present and an imperfect, the latter being the earlier, as in the Semitic languages. So the "root" without change stands for the imperfect, while the present either reduplicates it or adds *e*. The plural of the imperfect is indicated by an appended *es*, while the present for the same purpose adds *ne* or *meš*, the latter being itself the plural of the substantive verb *me*.²

The pronominal object is regularly *incorporated* between the personal sign and the "root." The subject and object stand before the verb, but the object is usually represented again by an incorporated pronoun. The adjective constantly follows its noun; but there is evidence to show that this order, like that of the prepositive (ordinary) conjugation, is the reverse of the original. In some compound ideograms, for example, the attributive sign comes first.

The following phrase (IV R. 4, 1-4b; cf. Familiengesetze, p. 57, n. 4) will give a general notion of the structure of an Akkadian sentence:

ġu-dim ki-damālā-šū ġa-ba-nib-RIRI šu-šaga-dingerāna-šū ġen-šin-gigi (= "bird-like place-wide-to may-he-him-flee hands-gracious-his-god-to may-he-them-return"): "Like a bird to a wide place may he flee to him; into the gracious hands of his god may he (into them) return."

Of the two autographed cuneiform documents prefixed to the work, general interest will attach to the new fragments of the Babylonian story of the Flood, which were discovered by Dr. Haupt in the British Museum in May, 1882. They are here accompanied by a translation (p. xli f.). They belong to the first column in IV R. 51, and are an important addition to the already published text, showing more clearly than ever that the last fragment published in col. I does not belong to this version of the Deluge story at all. The publication and explanation of these difficult fragments serve to supplement the translation (with transcription, commentary, and vocabulary) of the whole of the Deluge story made by Dr. Haupt for the second edition, just issued, of Schrader's "Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament." It is announced, moreover, on the cover of the work before us that Dr. Haupt has also in preparation an edition

¹ In this combination *dugā-ba*, *dug* is the "root," *ā* the "vowel of prolongation," and *ba* the "pronominal element."

² Cf. Familiengesetze, p. 31: *me* meant properly "to name" ("speak") or "have a name." To the ancient Akkadians, then, an object only *existed* when it had a *name*. This is just what a sound philosophy of speech leads us to expect.

of all the fragments yet discovered of the great Nimrod Epos, to be treated in the same way as he has already treated the Deluge story, and that his "Outlines of Assyrian Grammar" will soon be published, written in English.

Appended to the treatise under review are a few specimens of Akkadian composition which cannot fail to awaken a deep literary as well as scientific interest. They suggest the importance of that literature of pre-Semitic Babylonia which, even as it is imperfectly represented in the discoveries hitherto made, furnishes the key to the whole civilization of Western Asia. Akkadian studies may, in fact, now be said to be directly or indirectly indispensable to the historian of human culture as well as to the comparative linguist. To the Semitic student, indeed, some knowledge of Akkadian is absolutely necessary, to enable him to trace the history of many of the most common and important terms in his whole vocabulary; and the proof is almost complete that the primitive Semites before their separation must have long had at least the most intimate contact with the Sumero-Akkadian people. But many words also which have become the common property of the civilized world, must be traced to the same source. The names Euphrates and Tigris, for example, are no longer a puzzle, but are clearly Akkadian appellatives.¹ The modern words *cane*, *canon*, *canon*, *canal* go back through the Phœnician *kaneh* to the Akkadian *gin* "a reed," from the root *gin* (*gi*) "to bend."² But we owe to the pre-Semitic Babylonians something more than familiar words with the ideas they stand for in the history of civilization. Whole sciences that have dominated the thought of men and changed the face of the world, are found to have had their beginnings and an astonishing development among these gifted and reflective people, before as well as after their amalgamation with the conquering Semites. For the comparative history of religion this new science is perhaps of the most significance, and it will be one of the most interesting and important problems of the future to trace the influence exerted upon still surviving faiths by the devout seers and psalmists of Sumer and Akkad.

The appendix by Prof. Donner is noteworthy chiefly because it will probably remain the last word upon the much-vexed question of the affinity of the Sumero-Akkadian and the Ural-Altaic idioms. During the earlier days of Akkadian research it was the fashion to regard Akkadian as an early representative of the Ural-Altaic. Dr. Haupt combated this theory in the *Familiengesetze*, and the careful review here given by the eminent Ural-Altaic specialist completely substantiates the opinion there expressed. The points hitherto relied upon to establish relationship are the vowel harmony that appears to a limited extent in Akkadian, and a similarity in certain postpositions and pronouns, as well, of course, as the agglutinative character of the two systems. Now that so many of the former readings and hypothetical Akkadian forms have been shown to be fanciful, the points of resemblance are seen to be fewer; but even if the old word and form lists had remained sure, the theory of relationship would probably not have held its ground. The wider our knowledge of languages becomes, the clearer it appears that agglutination and even vowel-harmony are not the exclusive characteristics of one family of speech or even of a few, but are rather types of expression which are found in all quarters of the earth; and the list of homo-

¹ Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 169 ff.

² Cf. Hommel, *l. c.* p. 407 f.

phonous postpositions has never been large enough for a safe induction in favor of affinity. The positive value of Prof. Donner's contribution lies mainly in the parallel illustrations he has given of the structural features of the Akkadian, drawn not merely from the Tartaric and Finnish languages, but also from various idioms of Africa, Polynesia, and southern Asia.

Two errors in the book, due to oversight, should be pointed out. On p. 11, line 5, *su* should be read for *š*. In the Akkadian sentences, given in cuneiform characters, there should be inserted on p. 279, line 4, between *ta* and *munna* the ideogram for *dingera gale* "great God."

J. F. McC.

Cyprian von Antiochien u. die deutsche Faustsage. THEODOR ZAHN. Erlangen : Deichert, 1882. Pp. iv, 153.

The need most sorely felt by all students of medieval literature is that of a comprehensive treatise upon the formation of Christian imaginative literature—to speak more in the concrete, upon the lives of the saints, and the Christian apocrypha. Edward Schröder, in his admirable review of Horstmann's *Altengl. Legenden, Neue Folge*, in the *Anz. f. d. Alterth.* VIII, p. 101 sqq., has laid down very plainly the lines upon which such a treatise should be planned. Profiting by the researches and generalizations contained in Rohde's *Der griechische Roman u. seine Vorläufer*, he has shown that the apocryphal Gospels, the Clementine Recognitions, and the early lives of the saints borrowed their literary form and structure, their style, their atmosphere, and many even of their incidents, from the late Greek prose romances of the neo-Platonic school. The wide reading and clear thinking that he has compressed here into eight or nine pages are truly remarkable. I can but express the wish that Schröder may find the opportunity of expanding these few pages into a treatise of as many hundred, thereby enabling us to survey the entire field of Christian imaginative literature from the second to the seventh century. This work once done, we shall the better understand the later medieval literature of the several European countries, and learn to separate what is distinctively Germanic or Keltic from what is due to the infiltration of Greco-Oriental themes and forms.

Meanwhile the next best gift that one can offer us is an exhaustive monograph upon the growth of some one legend in particular. This Zahn has undertaken in the present work. The only general fault that I can find in it is its occasional prolixity. Perhaps also the arrangement of topics might be improved. I should have liked it better, had the author begun with his translation of the Cyprian legend, and deferred his analysis of Calderon's *Magico*, and his remarks upon the Simon Magus tradition and the Empress Eudocia's version of Cyprian, to Section IV. By adopting such an arrangement he would have avoided much repetition.

In itself the Cyprian legend is both striking and attractive; and it is additionally interesting to us in having furnished the subject for Calderon's well-known drama *El Magico Prodigioso*, and in presenting many points of resemblance to the still more celebrated Faust legend. Zahn cannot be praised too highly for translating entire the three books of the *Vita Cypriani et Justinae*. Few of us have the time or the patience to struggle through page after page of